

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Favorable reconsideration of this application as presently amended and in light of the following discussion is respectfully requested.

Claims 1-7 and 9-21 are pending in the present application. Claims 1, 6, 12, 14 and 17 are amended by the present amendment. Amended Claim 1 finds support at least in the specification at page 9, lines 6-24, for example. Claims 6, 12, 14 and 17 are amended for clarification. No new matter is added.

In the outstanding Office Action, Claims 1-7 and 9-21 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over Buchner et al. (U.S. Patent Publication No. 2002/0069063, now U.S. Patent 6,535,854, herein “Buchner”) in view of Welty (U.S. Patent 5,109,222).

Addressing the above-noted rejection, that rejection is traversed as discussed next.

Independent Claim 1 is amended to clarify features recited therein and to better define over Buchner and Welty. Specifically, Claim 1 now recites as follows:

“... a plurality of human presence sensors configured to be installed in different rooms of the house and linked to said HAS, said plurality of human presence sensors configured to sense a presence of the user and to provide a detection signal indicative of a particular one of the rooms where the presence of the user is sensed; and a room locating module configured to identify the particular room based on the detection signal, and to instruct to issue a voice message confirming an acceptance of the user’s request or a completion of the particular instruction from the speaker belonging to the identified room”

Applicants respectfully submit that neither Buchner nor Welty discloses or suggests the above-noted claimed features of amended Claim 1.

The outstanding Action acknowledges that Buchner fails to disclose or suggest the features “... a plurality of human presence sensors configured to be installed in different

rooms of the house ..." as recited in previously presented Claim 1.¹ In this regard, Applicants respectfully submit that Buchner fails to disclose or suggest the features related to the human presence sensors recited in amended Claim 1.

In addition, the outstanding Action appears to acknowledge that Buchner fails to disclose or suggest the features "... a room locating module configured to identify the particular room based on the detection signal, and to instruct to issue the voice message from the speaker belonging to the identified room ..." as recited in previously presented Claim 1.² In this regard, Applicants respectfully submit that Buchner fails to disclose or suggest the features related to the room locating module recited in amended Claim 1.

Turning to Welty, the outstanding Action indicates that column 5, lines 16-52 of Welty teaches the claimed human presence sensors, and that a sensor 12 of Figure 5 corresponds to the claimed human presence sensors.³

The above-noted portion of Welty (column 5, lines 16-52), and in particular, column 5, lines 47-52, describes that the infrared sensor 12 exchanges infrared signals with a remote control unit R and an electrically operable equipment, and that a particular room is identified upon affecting a sensor in the room by the infrared signals transmitted from the remote control unit R or the electrically operable equipment. However, Welty does not describe that the sensor 12 senses a presence of a user or provides a detection signal indicative of a particular one of the rooms where the presence of the user is sensed. More specifically, Welty fails to disclose or suggest the features "... said plurality of human presence sensors configured to sense a presence of the user and to provide a detection signal indicative of a particular one of the rooms where the presence of the user is sensed ..." as recited in amended Claim 1.

¹ See page 3, paragraph 4, last two lines, of the outstanding Action.

² See page 2, paragraph 2, of the outstanding Action.

³ See page 4, second paragraph, of the outstanding Action.

Moreover, the outstanding Action indicates that column 6, lines 5-13 of Welty teaches the features “... to instruct to issue the voice message from the speaker belonging to the identified room ...” as recited in previously presented Claim 1.⁴

The above-noted portion of Welty (column 6, lines 5-13) describes that the remote control unit R may include a speaker 31 and a microphone 37. However, Welty does not describe that a voice message confirming an acceptance of the user’s request or a completion of the particular instruction is issued from a speaker. More specifically, Welty fails to disclose or suggest the features “... to instruct to issue a voice message confirming an acceptance of the user’s request or a completion of the particular instruction from the speaker belonging to the identified room ...” as recited in amended Claim 1.

Because neither Buchner nor Welty discloses or suggests the above-noted claimed features as recited in amended Claim 1, the combined teachings of Buchner and Welty do not render obvious the structure as recited in amended Claim 1.

Accordingly, it is respectfully submitted that independent Claim 1, and the claims depending therefrom, patentably distinguish over Buchner and Welty.

⁴ See page 4, third paragraph, of the outstanding Action.

As no other issues are pending in this application, it is respectfully submitted that the present application is now in condition for allowance, and it is hereby respectfully requested that this case be passed to issue.

Respectfully submitted,

OBLON, SPIVAK, McCLELLAND,
MAIER & NEUSTADT, P.C.

Customer Number

22850

Tel: (703) 413-3000

Fax: (703) 413 -2220
(OSMMN 06/04)

MM/SNS/GS:mda

I:\ATTY\Gs\20s\208490\AME 2_FILED.DOC

Surinder Sachar

Masayasu Mori
Attorney of Record
Registration No. 47,301

Surinder Sachar
Registration No. 34,423